



Comment on “Ultra low frequency (ULF) electromagnetic anomalies associated with large earthquakes in Java Island, Indonesia by using wavelet transform and detrended fluctuation analysis” by Febriani et al. (2014)

F. Masci¹ and J. N. Thomas^{2,3,4}

¹Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, L'Aquila, Italy

²NorthWest Research Associates, Redmond, Washington, USA

³Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, DigiPen Institute of Technology, Redmond, Washington, USA

⁴Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA

Correspondence to: F. Masci (fabrizio.masci@ingv.it)

Received: 31 March 2015 – Published in Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.: 23 September 2015

Revised: 9 December 2015 – Accepted: 9 December 2015 – Published: 18 December 2015

Abstract. We examine the recent report of Febriani et al. (2014) in which the authors show changes in ULF magnetic field data prior to the M7.5 Tasikmalaya earthquake that occurred south of Java, Indonesia, on 2 September 2009. Febriani et al. (2014) state that the magnetic changes they found may be related to the impending earthquake. We do not agree that the pre-earthquake magnetic changes shown in Febriani et al. (2014) are seismogenic. These magnetic changes, indeed, are too closely related to global geomagnetic disturbances to be regarded as being of seismic origin.

1 Introduction

Febriani et al. (2014) report changes in ultra low frequency (ULF: 0.001–5 Hz) geomagnetic field data a few weeks before the 2 September 2009 Tasikmalaya earthquake (M7.5, hypocentral depth 57 km) from a ground-based sensor at Pelabuhan Ratu, West Java, Indonesia, 135 km from the epicentre. This was the largest and, according to the authors, the only earthquake preceded by anomalous magnetic changes of 12 $M > 5$ earthquakes that occurred offshore south of Java from 1 September 2008 to 31 October 2010.

Febriani et al. (2014) suggest that the magnetic changes they reported may have been induced by an alleged preparatory phase of the earthquake. The idea that electromagnetic

precursors may appear before earthquakes is based on the hypothesis that earthquakes have a preparatory phase. That is, the earthquake initiates in a preparation zone (whose size depends on the magnitude of the earthquake) where physical phenomena lead to the subsequent shock and to the possible appearance of precursory signals (see, e.g. Dobrovolsky et al., 1979). However, many researchers disagree that earthquakes have a preparatory phase (see, e.g. Geller, 1997; Kagan, 1997). According to them earthquakes appear to be chaotic, scale-invariant phenomena controlled by the local physical properties of the fault whose geometry and frictional characteristics determine the starting and stopping of the rupture. Therefore, any small shock may grow into a stronger earthquake, and how big the quake will become is determined by how it is stopped, and not by how it starts (Johnston, 2015). Therefore, the notion of a preparatory phase of earthquakes appears to have no physical basis.

There are many papers (see the references section in Masci, 2010, 2011a, 2013) in which the authors report pre-earthquake changes in ULF magnetic field data suggesting a possible relationship between the changes they identified and the impending earthquake. Conversely, recent reports (see e.g. Campbell, 2009; Thomas et al., 2009a, b; Masci, 2010, 2011a, b, 2012, 2013; Masci and De Luca, 2013; Masci and Thomas, 2013a, b, 2015) have shown that many of these pre-earthquake changes are, indeed, global-scale variations driven by the frequent disturbances in the geomagnetic field,

or they are generated by instrumental malfunction. These papers have cast serious doubt on the idea that ULF magnetic anomalies are convincing and always recurring phenomena preceding large earthquakes. Therefore, at present ULF magnetic disturbances cannot be considered a promising candidate for developing earthquake prediction capabilities. We note that Febriani et al. (2014) ignore the findings of the recent reports in which it has been shown that many ULF magnetic changes reported to occur before earthquakes are not precursors. They, in fact, refer to these invalid precursors as support of the search for precursory signatures of earthquake in ULF magnetic data (see Table S1 in the Supplement). In support of their findings, they also refer to the Hattori's empirical relationship between the earthquake magnitude and the distance from the earthquake epicentre of the ULF station where the pre-earthquake anomaly has been detected (see Febriani et al. (2014), Fig. 10). In Fig. S1 of the Supplement, we show this relationship where we have highlighted with red dots alleged ULF magnetic precursory changes that have been proven invalid. In Table S2 we report the papers in which these alleged precursors have been denied. Note that the empirical relationship shown in Fig. S1 is taken from Febriani et al. (2014) and is not derived from undisputed precursors. Thus, we conclude that Febriani et al. (2014) were motivated to search for precursory signals in magnetic data by reports of false precursors of earthquake.

2 Comments

Febriani et al. (2014) analyse nighttime (16:00–21:00 UT) geomagnetic field data in the frequency range 10 ± 3 mHz. They calculate the ratio between the spectral intensity of the vertical and each horizontal magnetic field components, i.e. the so-called spectral density ratio. According to Febriani et al. (2014), the magnetic data analysed are very disturbed by artificial noise even during nighttime. Thus, before performing the spectral analysis based on wavelet transform, they remove the intense transient signals. Then, they use the minimum energy method in an attempt to further reduce the noise. More precisely, for each day, they divide 4 h (16:30–20:30 UT) of magnetic data in eight 30 min intervals. Data before 16:30 UT and after 20:30 UT are excluded due to the edge effect of the wavelet transform. Then, the energy of the geomagnetic field vertical component Z (the component usually more disturbed by artificial noise) is calculated in each 30 min interval. Finally, the spectral density ratio is calculated in the interval where Z shows the minimum energy. Febriani et al. (2014) investigate the scaling properties of the geomagnetic field components by means of detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) as well. DFA is a well-established method to extract quantitative time dynamic in time series. The DFA α exponent can be considered as an indicator of the roughness of the time series: the higher α is, the smoother the

time series (Peng et al., 1995). α may be related to the fractal dimension D by the relationship $D = 3 - \alpha$.

In Fig. 1 we show the spectral density ratio S_Z/S_Y (where Y is the east–west component of the geomagnetic field) and the DFA α exponent of the Z component, as reported by Febriani et al. (2014, Fig. 9) 30 days before and after 2 September 2009. According to them, a magnetic anomaly is identified when the exponent α and the ratio S_Z/S_Y exceed the threshold value of $\bar{\alpha} - 2\sigma_\alpha$ and $\bar{S_Z/S_Y} + 2\sigma_{S_Z/S_Y}$, respectively. Mean values and the corresponding σ are calculated over the 2-month period in Fig. 1. Based on their definition of an anomaly, Febriani et al. (2014) report to have found anomalous changes prior to the Tasikmalaya earthquake. More specifically, a few weeks before the earthquake, they note a decrease of the exponent α , which corresponds to an increase of ratio S_Z/S_Y (see shaded areas in Fig. 1). Febriani et al. (2014) maintain that the decrease of α in correspondence with the increase of the spectral density ratio identifies a precursory signature of the Tasikmalaya earthquake in magnetic data. No changes in S_Z/S_Y and α are shown co-incident with the earthquake when the primary energy is released.

We disagree with Febriani et al. (2014). First, there is no physical reason that magnetic anomalies, whatever their origin might be, are identified when the exponent α and the spectral S_Z/S_Y exceed the threshold values they assumed. Then, their method for checking the geomagnetic conditions by means of the Dst index is not rigorous. We agree that geomagnetic activity should be a key parameter in interpreting observed pre-earthquake ULF magnetic changes (see Balasis and Manda, 2007). ULF disturbances from the ionosphere and magnetosphere, indeed, may lead researchers to interpret erroneously the origin of magnetic anomalies they identified (see, e.g. Masci, 2010, 2011a). The 3 h global geomagnetic index Kp and the daily sum ΣKp are usually used as representative of the geomagnetic activity over planetary scales (Menvielle and Berthelier, 1991). Conversely, the Dst index that Febriani et al. (2014) use for checking the geomagnetic conditions is designed to monitor the strength of the equatorial electrojet, and it is usually used as indicator of the geomagnetic storm level and ring current intensification (Mayaud, 1980).

As expected, in Fig. 1 we note many decreases of α in correspondence with increases in the spectral density ratio. This inverse correspondence may be explained by taking into account that the spectral density ratio, the DFA α exponent, and the fractal dimension D of the ULF geomagnetic field are sensitive to global trends in geomagnetic activity (see Masci, 2010, 2011a; Wanliss et al., 2014). Namely, when the geomagnetic activity decreases, the reduction of the geomagnetic field horizontal component is usually larger than the reduction of the vertical component. Therefore the spectral density ratio increases. At the same time, the decrease of the geomagnetic activity indicates that the magnetosphere evolves toward a lower degree of organization (see, e.g. Bal-




Figure 1. ULF analysis (10 ± 3 mHz) at the time of the 2 September 2009 Tasikmalaya earthquake as reported by Febriani et al. (2014, Fig. 9). Day = 0 is the day of the earthquake. **(a)** DFA α exponent of the magnetic field vertical Z component. The horizontal blue line refers to $(\bar{\alpha} - 2\sigma_{\alpha})$. **(b, c)** Spectral density ratio S_Z/S_Y calculated without and with the minimum energy method. The horizontal blue line refers to $(\bar{S_Z/S_Y} - 2\sigma_{S_Z/S_Y})$. Shaded areas refer to the anomalies stated to be precursors of the 2 September Tasikmalaya earthquake by Febriani et al. (2014). **(d)** Dst index. ΣKp index time series has been superimposed onto the original views. See text for details.

asis et al., 2009). Thus, the fractal dimension of the geomagnetic field increases, while the DFA α exponent decreases. On the contrary, an increase of the geomagnetic activity induces a decrease of the spectral density ratio (because the increase in the geomagnetic field horizontal components is larger than the increase of the vertical component) and a decrease of the fractal dimension and an increase of α (because the magnetosphere evolves towards a higher degree of organization). Thus, we expect to find an inverse correspondence between ΣKp and the spectral density ratio and the fractal dimension of the geomagnetic field, and a direct correspondence between ΣKp and the α exponent. However, due to global averaging used to calculate Kp, this correspondence is not expected always or everywhere. In this perspective, recent papers (see Masci, 2010, 2011a, 2013, and other papers reported in Tables S1 and S2) have demonstrated that many pre-earthquake ULF magnetic changes hypothesized to be seismogenic are, instead, part of global geomagnetic activity changes. In Fig. 1 we have used the same approach adopted in these papers by comparing the exponent α and the ratio S_Z/S_Y reported by Febriani et al. (2014) with the ΣKp index. In Fig. 1a, as expected, we note a close corre-

spondence between α and ΣKp , both before and after the earthquake. A close inverse correspondence can be also seen in Fig. 1b between ΣKp and the ratio S_Z/S_Y calculated without the minimum energy method. However, we would like to point out that we should not expect to always find this correspondence, since (i) as stated by Febriani et al. (2014) the high environmental noise in the geomagnetic field components was not attenuated enough after removing intense transient signals; (ii) several gaps are present in α and S_Z/S_Y time series; (iii) S_Z/S_Y shows many inexplicable zero values; (iv) α and S_Z/S_Y are calculated from local magnetic data, whereas, as already mentioned above, ΣKp is representative of daily averaged geomagnetic disturbances on a planetary scale. Contrary to Fig. 1b, however, in Fig. 1c we see a lower correspondence between S_Z/S_Y calculated applying the minimum energy method and ΣKp . The lower correspondence may be explained considering that for each day Febriani et al. (2014) calculate the spectral density ratio, using the minimum energy method, in one of the eight 30 min intervals between 16:30 and 20:30 UT. Since ΣKp is representative of global daily averaged geomagnetic disturbance, by reducing the period of analysis, it is likely that the correspondence be-

tween geomagnetic data and ΣKp becomes less noticeable. Thus, the high dispersion of S_Z/S_Y values in Fig. 1c may be due to the short time interval (30 min) used in the spectral analysis, as well as because the S_Z/S_Y time series consists of values that are calculated in different 30 min intervals.

3 Conclusions

We have reviewed the findings of Febriani et al. (2014) that show pre-earthquake changes in magnetic field record before the M7.5 Tasikmalaya earthquake occurred on 2 September 2009 south of Java. We have shown that the changes they reported in the DFA α exponent of the geomagnetic field vertical component and the spectral density ratio S_Z/S_Y are closely related to the geomagnetic ΣKp index and are unlikely to be of seismogenic origin. Thus, we conclude that the pre-earthquake magnetic changes reported by Febriani et al. (2014) are an effect of the global geomagnetic activity.

The Supplement related to this article is available online at doi:10.5194/nhess-15-2697-2015-supplement.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Italy, Sez. Roma 2, and by the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program through external research grants G11AP20177 and G15AP00071 to J. N. Thomas. The authors wish to thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. The ΣKp index was provided by Kyoto World Data Center for Geomagnetism (<http://swdcwww.kugi.kyoto-u.ac.jp/>).

Edited by: B. D. Malamud

Reviewed by: two anonymous referees

References

- Balasis, G., Daglis, I. A., Papadimitriou, C., Kalimeri, M., Anastasiadis, A., and Eftaxias, K.: Investigating dynamical complexity in the magnetosphere using various entropy measures, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, A00D06, doi:10.1029/2008JA014035, 2009.
- Balasis, G. and Manda, M.: Can electromagnetic disturbances related to the recent great earthquakes be detected by satellite magnetometers?, *Tectonophysics*, 431, 173–195, doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2006.05.038, 2007.
- Campbell, W. H.: Natural magnetic disturbance fields, not precursors, preceding the Loma Prieta earthquake, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, A05307, doi:10.1029/2008JA013932, 2009.
- Dobrovolsky, I. P., Zubkov, S. I., and V. I. Miachkin: Estimation of the size of earthquake preparation zones, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 117, 1025–1044, doi:10.1007/BF00876083, 1979.
- Febriani, F., Han, P., Yoshino, C., Hattori, K., Nurdianto, B., Effendi, N., Maulana, I., and Gaffar, E.: Ultra low frequency (ULF) electromagnetic anomalies associated with large earthquakes in Java Island, Indonesia by using wavelet transform and detrended fluctuation analysis, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14, 789–798, doi:10.5194/nhess-14-789-2014, 2014.
- Geller, R. J.: Earthquake prediction: A critical review, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 131, 425–450, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.1997.tb06588.x, 1997.
- Johnston, M. J. S.: On earthquake fault failure, 26th IUGG General Assembly, P121, IUGG-1001, 22 June–2 July 2015, Prague, Czech Republic, 2015.
- Kagan, Y.Y.: Are earthquake predictable?, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 131, 505–525, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.1997.tb06595.x, 1997.
- Masci, F.: On claimed ULF seismogenic fractal signatures in the geomagnetic field, *J. Geophys. Res.-Space Phys.*, 115, A10236, doi:10.1029/2010JA015311, 2010.
- Masci, F.: On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components, *Phys. Earth Planet. Int.*, 187, 19–32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011a.
- Masci, F.: Brief communication “On the recent reaffirmation of ULF magnetic earthquakes precursors”, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 11, 2193–2198, doi:10.5194/nhess-11-2193-2011, 2011b.
- Masci, F.: On the ULF magnetic ratio increase before the 2008 Iwate-Miyagi Nairiku earthquake by Hirano and Hattori (2011), *J. Asian Earth Sci.*, 56, 258–262, doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2012.05.020, 2012.
- Masci, F.: On the multi-fractal characteristics of the ULF geomagnetic field before the 1993 Guam earthquake, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 13, 187–191, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-187-2013, 2013.
- Masci, F. and De Luca, G.: Some comments on the potential seismogenic origin of magnetic disturbances observed by Di Lorenzo et al. (2011) close to the time of the 6 April 2009 L'Aquila earthquake, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 13, 1313–1319, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-1313-2013, 2013.
- Masci, F. and Thomas, J. N.: Comment on “Fractal analysis of ULF electromagnetic emissions in possible association with earthquakes in China” by Ida et al. (2012), *Nonlin. Processes Geophys.*, 20, 417–421, doi:10.5194/npg-20-417-2013, 2013a.
- Masci, F. and Thomas, J. N.: Review Article: On the relation between the seismic activity and the Hurst exponent of the geomagnetic field at the time of the 2000 Izu swarm, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 13, 2189–2194, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-2189-2013, 2013b.
- Masci, F. and Thomas, J. N.: Are there new findings in the search for ULF magnetic precursors to earthquakes?, *J. Geophys. Res.-Space Phys.*, doi:10.1002/2015JA021336, in press, 2015.
- Mayaud, P. N.: Derivation, Meaning, and Use of Geomagnetic Indices, *Geophysical Monograph* 22, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C., 1980.
- Menvielle, M. and Bertelier, A.: The K-derived planetary indices: description and availability, *Rev. Geophys.*, 29, 415–432, doi:10.1029/91RG00994, 1991.
- Peng, C. K., Havlin, S., Stanley, H. E., and Goldberger, A. L.: Quantification of scaling exponents and crossover phenomena in nonstationary heartbeat time series, *Chaos*, 5, 82–87, doi:10.1063/1.166141, 1995.
- Thomas, J. N., Love, J. J., and Johnston, M. J. S.: On the reported magnetic precursor of the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquakes, *Phys. Earth Planet. Int.*, 173, 207–215, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2008.11.014, 2009a.

Thomas, J. N., Love, J. J., Johnston, M. J. S., and Yumoto, K.: On the reported magnetic precursor of the 1993 Guam earthquake, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L16301, doi:10.1029/2009GL039020, 2009b.

Wanliss, J. A., Shiokawa, K., and Yumoto, K.: Latitudinal variation of stochastic properties of the geomagnetic field, *Nonlin. Processes Geophys.*, 21, 347–356, doi:10.5194/npg-21-347-2014, 2014.



Supplement of

Comment on “Ultra low frequency (ULF) electromagnetic anomalies associated with large earthquakes in Java Island, Indonesia by using wavelet transform and detrended fluctuation analysis” by Febriani et al. (2014)

F. Masci and J. N. Thomas

Correspondence to: F. Masci (fabrizio.masci@ingv.it)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC-BY 3.0 licence.




Figure S1. The black continuous line indicates the empirical relationship ($R = 40M - 180$) between the earthquake magnitude M and the distance R from the epicenter of the ULF station where the anomaly was observed (see Febriani et al., 2014, Fig. 10). We have included the Biak earthquake as in the original views by Hattori et al. (2004) and Hayakawa et al. (2007). Note that the relationship was derived using invalid ULF precursors (see Table S2).

References

- Hattori, K., Takahashi I., Yoshino, C., Isezaki N., Iwasaki H., Harada M., Kawabata K., Kopytenko E., Kopytenko Y., Maltsev P., Korepanov V., Molchanov O., Hayakawa M., Noda Y., Nagao T., and S. Uyeda: ULF geomagnetic field measurements in Japan and some recent results associated with Iwateken Nairiku Hokubu earthquake in 1998, *Phys. Chem. Earth*, 29, 481–494, doi:10.1016/j.pce.2003.09.019, 2004.
- Hayakawa, M., Hattori, K., and Ohta, K.: Monitoring of ULF (ultralow-frequency) geomagnetic variations associated with earthquakes, *Sensors*, 7, 1108–1122, doi:10.3390/s7071108, 2007.

Table S1. Papers cited by Febriani et al. (2014) (and corresponding reviews) that have reported invalid ULF magnetic precursors.

Papers	Earthquake	Reviews
Akinaga et al., 2001.	1999 Chi-Chi earthquake	Masci, F., 2011a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001
Fraser-Smith et al., 1990.	1989 Loma Prieta	Campbell, 2009, doi:10.1029/2008JA013932 * Thomas et al., 2009a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2008.11.014
Hattori, 2004.	1998 Iwateken Nairiku Hokubu 1997 Kagoshimaken-Hokuseibu	Masci, F., 2011a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001
Hattori et al., 2002.	1997 Kagoshimaken-Hokuseibu	Masci, F., 2011a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001
Hattori et al., 2004a.	1998 Iwateken Nairiku Hokubu	Masci, F., 2011a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001
Hattori et al., 2004b.	2000 Izu	Masci, F., 2011b, doi:10.5194/nhess-11-2193-2011.
Hayakawa et al., 2008.	1993 Guam	Masci, F., 2010, doi:10.1029/2010JA015311. Masci, F., 2013, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-187-2013.
Hayakawa et al., 1996.	1993 Guam	Masci, F., 2011a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001 Thomas et al . 2009b, doi:1029/2009GL039020
Hayakawa et al., 2007.	1997 Kagoshimaken-Hokuseibu	Masci, F., 2011a, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001
Hirano and Hattori, 2011.	2008 Iwate–Miyagi Nairiku	Masci, F., 2012, doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2012.06.009.
Ida and Hayakawa, 2006.	1993 Guam	Masci, F., 2010, doi:10.1029/2010JA015311.
Ida et al., 2006.	1993 Guam	Masci, F., 2013, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-187-2013

* Reply: Fraser-Smith et al., (2011), Comment on “Natural magnetic disturbance fields, not precursors, preceding the Loma Prieta earthquake” by Wallace H. Campbell, J. Geophys. Res., 116, A08228, doi:10.1029/2010JA016379.

Table S2. Papers where alleged ULF precursors highlighted in Figure S1 by red dots have been denied.

Earthquake	Reviews
Loma Prieta EQ 17-10-1989	<p>Campbell, W. H. (2009), Natural magnetic disturbance fields, not precursors, preceding the Loma Prieta earthquake, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i>, 114, A05307, doi:10.1029/2008JA013932.*</p> <p>Thomas, J. N., Love, J. J., Johnston, M. J. S.: On the reported magnetic precursor of the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquakes, <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 173, 207-215, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2008.11.014, 2009.</p>
Guam EQ 08-08-1993	<p>Thomas, J. N., Love, J. J., Johnston, M. J. S., Yumoto, K.: On the reported magnetic precursor of the 1993 Guam earthquake, <i>Geophys. Res. Lett.</i>, 36, L16301, doi:10.1029/2009GL039020, 2009.</p> <p>Masci, F.: On claimed ULF seismogenic fractal signatures in the geomagnetic field, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i>, A10236,115, doi:10.1029/2010JA015311, 2010.</p> <p>Masci, F.: On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p> <p>Masci, F.: Brief communication “On the recent reaffirmation of ULF magnetic earthquakes precursors”, <i>Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.</i>, 11, 2193–2198, doi:10.5194/nhess-11-2193-2011, 2011.</p> <p>Masci, F.: On the multi-fractal characteristics of the ULF geomagnetic field before the 1993 Guam earthquake, <i>Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.</i>, 13, 187–191, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-187-2013, 2013.</p>
Biak EQ 17-02-1996	<p>Masci, F.: On claimed ULF seismogenic fractal signatures in the geomagnetic field, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i>, A10236,115, doi:10.1029/2010JA015311, 2010.</p> <p>Masci, F.: 2011, On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p>
Kagoshima EQs 03-26-1997, 05-13-1997	<p>Masci, F.: 2011, On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p>
Iwate EQ 03-09-1998	<p>Masci, F.: 2011, On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p>
Izu Swarm April-May 1998	<p>Masci, F.: 2011, On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p>
Chi-Chi EQ 21-09-1999	<p>Masci, F.: 2011, On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p>
Izu Swarm June-August 2000	<p>Masci, F.: 2011, On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field components. <i>Phys. Earth Planet. Int.</i>, 187, 19-32, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001, 2011.</p> <p>Masci, F., and J.N., Thomas: On the relation between the seismic activity and the Hurst exponent of the geomagnetic field at the time of the 2000 Izu swarm, <i>Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.</i>, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-2189-2013, 2013.</p>
Miyagi EQ 13-06-2008	<p>Masci, F.: On the ULF magnetic ratio increase before the 2008 Iwate–Miyagi Nairiku earthquake by Hirano and Hattori (2011), <i>J. Asian Earth Sci.</i>, 56, 258–262, doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2012.06.009, 2012.</p>

* Reply: Fraser-Smith et al., (2011), Comment on “Natural magnetic disturbance fields, not precursors, preceding the Loma Prieta earthquake” by Wallace H. Campbell, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, A08228, doi:10.1029/2010JA016379.